DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 265 CS 205 055

AUTHOR De Mott, John
TITLE Newspaper Ethics and Managing Editors: The Evolution of APME's Code.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (62nd, Houston, Texas, August 5-8, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Codes of Ethics; *Ethics; *Journalism; *Newspapers; Standards
IDENTIFIERS *Associated Press Managing Editors

ABSTRACT

A review of the 42-year development of the professional code of ethics of the Associated Press Managing Editors (APME) demonstrates an effort to elevate newspaper ethical standards around the country. Following the example of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in establishing its "Canons of Journalism" in 1923, the APME formed a criteria committee that reviewed the findings of the Commission on Freedom of the Press (Hutchins Commission), the British Royal Commission, and the Brinton-Bush-Newell studies. In addition, 43 newspapers and the heads of 11 journalism schools were asked: "What makes a responsible, good, successful and community-conscious newspaper?" From material assembled during its study, the committee developed four criteria of a good newspaper: accuracy, responsibility, integrity, and leadership. Responding to a continued concern over the ethical problems of press/government relations, the free press/fair trial controversy, respect for privacy, and journalistic involvement in politics, the APME later created a professional standards committee that developed the present code of ethics and continues to study such topics as newspaper credibility, contests, press-created issues, sensationalism, political perquisites, and other ethical issues. (APME's Code of Ethics is included.) (AEA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED176265

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NEWSPAPER ETHICS AND MANAGING EDITORS:

THE EVOLUTION OF APME'S CODE

By

John De Mott
Associate Professor

Department of Journalism
Temple University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John De Mott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented to the Qualitative Studies Division, Association for Education in Journalism Annual Convention, Houston, Texas, August 1979.

CS205065

The creation of a professional code of ethics like that of the Associated Press Managing Editors association can be seen as a long and gradual process, and at the same time a more or less spontaneous response to a strong leader or leaders devoted to the better articulation of some profession's ideals, commitments and aspirations.[1]

Both representations of code creation are reasonable, of course, depending upon whether one focuses his or her attention on the appearance of a formal document or the slow evolution of its uncodified principles through generations of professional growth and development.[2]

"A professional ethic can be formed without formal machinery of an elaborate code," Penn Kimball has pointed out.[3] "Professionalization is a human process, a feeling that comes over a person when he behaves in concert with his conscience."[4]

More recently, and of journalism specifically, Dean Ira W. Cole of Northwestern University's Medill school observed that "starting from the first stories you write in journalism school, you have to make a whole bunch of value judgments in a situational context. And eventually you discover, I've got a whole list of things that are my dos and don'ts. And those are your ethics."[4]

Given those presumed dynamics of code creation,[5] the recognized skill of journalists in articulation,[6] and today's generally-acknowledged need for news media to inspire more confidence and credibility,[7] it's easy to appreciate the following observations on ethics by Charles B. Seib, ombudsman and press criticism columnist for the Washington Post:

> If I seem a little uncomfortable...it is because ethics with a capital "E" is a word that is seldom heard in newsrooms, where I have spent most of my professional life.

> It is true that when three or more editors get together they will write a code of ethics unless somebody stops them. That happens mostly at conventions, and it is probably a way of letting off steam that is more suited to their high office than wearing funny hats or dropping bags of water out of hotel windows, and probably just as harmless.[8]

"So there are many codes of ethics," Seib pointed out, mentioning several--including that of the Associated Press Managing Editors--specifically.[9]

Despite the predilection toward writing codes of ethics facetiously assumed by Seib, members of the Managing Editors association met annually and conducted quite extensive convention activities for many years before creating a formal code of ethics.[10]

APME's code was not adopted until 1975, although the association itself had been established in 1933.[11]

Throughout those intervening 42 years, however, members of the association individually were dedicated, presumably, to the implementation of codes formulated by additional professional associations or other journalistic organizations to which some of them belonged or had belonged formerly.[12]

Such organizations included the Society of Professional Journalists, originally known as Sigma Delta Chi, which had adapted to its use the "Canons of Journalism" of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, adopted immediately after ASNE's organization in 1923.[13] In 1973, SPJ's committee on professional development rewrote the ASNE "canons" into a new code for SPJ.[14] In addition to overlapping SPJ's membership, the APME membership has always included some members of ASNE and also the National Conference of Editorial Writers, which has its own code of ethics.[15] Furthermore, codes of ethics had been adopted by some newspapers themselves and by a number of state press associations.[16] In addition, some managing editors are former members--current members, even--of the American Newspaper Guild, which has had its own code for many years.[17]

The discussion of numerous problems in the field of ethics has been a characteristic of APME conventions throughout the association's history, although the term ethics did not appear often in discussion or program topics or titles.[18]

As a result of such concern over questionable behavior or conduct by associates, exceptionally devoted members of any vocational group find themselves, often, prompted to make the group more professional.[19] Such efforts have been observed, naturally, and studied by social scientists.[20] The phenomenon has been discussed, from time to time, under the subject of "emerging professions."[21]

It is the "elite" of an "emerging" profession, it has been noted,[22] that pushes for the advancement of "professionalization" in its occupational group and claims recognition of status. Towards those ends, members of the occupation's "elite" engage in "taking pains to construct and publish a code of ethics." Such codes often contain quite sweeping generalities, of course--at this stage of the profession's development--and the group is unable to command conformance to its code."[23]

Such codes of ethics "frequently reflect hopes and aspirations rather than obtainable goals," Seib observed, following a look at APME's and similar codes. "They specialize in high-flown language," he noted.[24]

"An interesting thing happens, though," Seib points out, "as you descend... to individual newspapers. The codes become more specific and less concerned with ethics with a capital 'E'. At the lower levels they are concerned more with behavior--how to stay out of trouble. Do not take free whiskey at Christmastime. Do not take free trips anytime. In a good many newsrooms the only concern for ethics is a note that goes up on the bulletin board just before Thanksgiving saying that no one should accept a Christmas gift worth more than three dollars."[25]

Just such a concern for "freebies," as gifts from sources are known in journalism, was one of the factors that prompted APME to formalize and publish its ethical standards.[26]

Formal articulation of most of the elemental standards and principles began about a generation earlier, however, with the creation, in 1960, of an extraordinary APME task force to establish a set of criteria by which the readers of any newspaper could judge its quality and performance.[27]

The idea for such a project is attributed to J. Edward Murray, at that time managing editor of the Arizona Republic and president of APME.[28]

Despite considerable skepticism concerning the project's feasibility, and even some real opposition to it by APME members, Murray ventured to initiate it. Objectives of the project, as outlined by Murray, were:

1. To agree on critieria for a good newspaper, regardless of its size.

2. To state such criteria clearly enough for use by the average reader in judging his own newspaper.

3. To establish these criteria as both working standard and target goal for the large number of excellent newspapers which never get on the two or three lists of the "Ten Great Newspapers."

4. To publicize the criteria widely for the benefit of working newsmen as well as for honest critics of newspapers.[29]

To the special task force, known officially as APME's Criteria Committee, Murray and the following additional persons eventually were appointed: John H. Colburn, Richmond Times-Dispatch; Frank Eyerly, Des Moines Register and Tribune; Vincent S. Jones, Gannett Newspapers; James S. Pope, Louisville Courier-Journal and Times; and J. Montgomery Curtis, American Press Institute.[30]

Colburn served as chairman and authored the report, entitled "What Makes a Good Newspaper?"[31]

"How can you judge its performance?", Colburn asked, in discussing the background of his committee's study and report.[32]

The committee was trying to answer old questions," Colburn pointed out, "and it is doubtful if anyone will ever find easy answers."[33]

Terming his committee's project "the first broad-scale professional attempt ever made" to establish a code designed to enable the public to judge a newspaper's

performance in its own marketplace, by comparing stated values with performance, Colburn said the committee sought to accomplish these aims:

1. To show that the vast majority of the daily newspapers in the United States are serving their communities in a responsible and informative manner;

2. To show that many newspapers of all sizes not only match, but often excel, the standards so often accepted in listings of the country's 'best' newspapers;

3. To give the public a blueprint to help it sift responsible criticism of newspapers from the irrespondible and thus help to protect the stake everyone has in an independent press--one of our vital hallmarks of freedom.[34]

As a point of departure for its study, Colburn's committee used the five "requirements" for a free and responsible press developed by the Commission on Freedom of the Press, or Hutchins commission. Those "requirements" are:

1. A truthful, comprehensive, and intelligent account of the days events in a context which gives them meaning.

2. A forum for the exchange of comment and criticism.

3. A means of projecting the opinions and atitudes of the groups in the society to one another.

4. A method of presenting and clarifying the goals and values of the society.

5. A way of reaching every member of the society by the currents of information, thought and feeling which the press supplies.[35]

The Hutchins commission, which submitted its report in 1947, was the first group ever to take "a penetrative look" at this country's press, Colburn observed. "However, none of the members was a newspaperman," Colburn observed, and that "lack of representation" resulted in considerable press criticism of the report.[36]

Subsequently, in 1949, Colburn related, Editor & Publisher magazine sponsored a 10-member panel of newspapermen and educators to consider plans for a "joint appraisal of the self-improvement possibilities" of newspapers through studies of specific problems. Out of that panel discussion emerged, in 1950, a study by ASNE that found the following:

> The self-improvement of...newspapers depends chiefly upon the character of...newspapermen, their recognition and acceptance of the great responsibilities...their faithfulness to duty in giving the people of this country a truthful account of the day's news and fair comment thereon and their willingness to profit by the intelligent criticism of the newspaper-reading public.[37]

Recognition and acceptance of these responsibilities were underscored 10 years later, Colburn remarked, in historic Williamsburg. There, where Virginia adopted in 1776 a Declaration of Rights--"That freedom of the press is one of the great bulwarks of liberty and can never be restrained but by despotic governments"--APME had launched its Criteria study, Colburn pointed out.[38]

In its study, APME's Criteria Committee reviewed the findings of the British Royal Commission, in addition to those of the Hutchins commission, and the Brinton-Bush-Newell studies.[39]

In addition, 43 newspapers of all sizes, and the heads of 11 journalism schools, were asked this question: "What makes a responsible, good, successful and community-conscious newspaper?"[40]

An additional 12 newspapers and four more journalism schools contributed their views later.[41]

Forty-one factors were identified in the replies, Colburn recalled, and were grouped under five major headings: Integrity, accuracy, complete and unbiased news, leadership and character.[42]

A preliminary analysis of those factors was submitted to the APME's Executive Committee and to a meeting of committee chairmen at New York in September, 1961. Those meetings stimulated comment, Colburn states, that reflected (1) extensive interest in the subject, and (2) considerable uncertainty as to "how to develop the outline into an effective workable document." The reaction could be summarized in this manner, Colburn explained:

> The criteria should be a working newsroom Bible and not a mere code that will be read and forgotten. It should cover the make-up and physical appearance of a newspaper and the part it plays in bringing exciting chapters of living history to the

home every day. The criteria itself must 'breathe' a sense of excitement if it is to be a meaningful, and a sharp definition must be made between the guideposts for hard handling of news and those affecting the corporate image of the newspaper as a whole.[43]

From material assembled during its study, which was concluded in August, 1962, the committee developed its "Criteria of a Good Newspaper."[44]

"A good newspaper prints the important news and provides information, comment and guidance that is most useful to its readers," the report of Colburn's committee stated. The report continued:

> It reports fully and explains the meaning of local national and international events which are of major significance in its own community. Its editorial comment provides an informed opinion on matters of vital concern to its readers.
>
> By reflecting the total image of its own community in its news coverage and by providing wise counsel in its editorials, a good newspaper becomes a public conscience. It also must be lively, imaginative and original; it must have a sense of humor, and the power to arouse keen interest.
>
> To implement these principles of good editing requires a skilled staff, an attractive format, and adequate space for news and comment. The staff must possess the professional pride and competence necessary to breathe life and meaning into the daily record of history. Good writing must be combined with an effective typographical display of copy and pictures to capture the full drama and excitement of the day's news. Good printing is essential.
>
> News and comment of most immediate interest and importance to the local community shall have priority for the available space, which will depend on the size and resources of the newspaper.
>
> To assure a financially strong and independent publication, and one that is competitive with other media, a good newspaper must maintain effective circulation, advertising and promotion departments.
>
> Finally, a good newspaper should be guided in the publication of all material by a concern for truth, the hallmark of freedom and by a concern for human decency and human betterment.[45]

Following those statements, the report observed that "a good newspaper may judge its own performance--and be judged--by these criteria:

Accuracy--The newspaper shall (1) exert maximum effort to print the truth in all news situations, (2) strive for completeness and objectivity, (3) guard against carelessness, bias, or distortion by either emphasis or omission, and (4) correct promptly errors of fact.

Responsibility--The newspaper shall (1) select, edit and display news on the basis of its significance, interest and its genuine usefulness to the public, (2) edit news affecting public morals with candor and good taste and avoid an imbalance of a sensational, preponderantly negative or merely trivial news, (3) accent when possible a reasonable amount of news which illustrates the values of compassion, self-sacrifice, heroism, good citizenship and patriotism, (4) clearly define sources of news, tell the reader when competent sources cannot be identified and background with the facts public statements which the newspaper knows to be inaccurate, (5) uphold the constitutional right of free speech, respect rights of privacy and serve the public by helping to protect all rights and privileges guaranteed by law, and (6) instruct its staff members to conduct themselves with dignity and decorum.

Integrity--The newspaper shall (1) honestly and fairly select and edit its NEWS content to provide impartial treatment of disputed issues and thorough and dispassionate handling of controversial subjects, (2) practice humility and tolerance in all relations with news sources and the public and respect honest conflicting opinions or disagreement, and (3) label as EDITORIAL its own views or expressions of opinion and provide on the EDITORIAL page a forum for the exchange of pertinent comment and criticism, especially if it is in conflict with the newspaper's editorial point of view.

Leadership--The newspaper shall (1) stimulate and vigorously support public officials, private groups and individuals to increase the good works and eliminate the bad in the community, (2) serve as a constructive critic of government at all levels, providing leadership for necessary reforms or innovations, and exposing any wrong-doing in office or any misuse of public power, and (3) oppose selfish and unwholesome interests regardless of their size or influence.[46]

The Colburn task force criteria found ready acceptance by APME and thousands of copies of the report, in its booklet form, were distributed in the years following. The criteria were reprinted in other publications, and reproduced, repeatedly, for use in schools of journalism. Newspaper editors based talks to civic groups upon the criteria, and they were even converted into "A Litany For Newspaper Readers,"[47] for use in a "journalistic church service"[48] designed for observing the commencement of International Newspaper Week.

While the criteria committee report sought its appropriate place in the literature of their association, APME members continued to discuss problems of professional conduct at their meetings annually.[49]

A review of each year's convention program and the reports submitted by APME's numerous committees engaged in "continuing studies" reflects an increasing concern over press/government relationships, the free press-fair trial

controversy, respect for privacy, journalistic involvement in politics, other conflicts of interest and related ethical matters. In 1969, a listing of proposed newsroom training booklets suggested by an earlier basic training manual edited by Edward Miller of the Portland Oregonian[50] included ethical issues like relationships with public relations people, "free-loading," and "where to draw the line in accepting positions in community affairs."[51]

In response to the association's continuing concerns over ethical problems, a new APME committee--Professional Standards--was created and assigned to report at the association's convention of 1972.[52]

Named chairman of the committee was George N. Gill, managing editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal.[53]

The committee conducted extensive studies of outside activities by news department staffers, the prevalence of gifts to newspeople and atititudes toward them, travel "junketeering" the sponsorship of newspaper "awards" competition, educational standards in journalism, and the Minnesota Press Council's operation.[54]

In a convention program devoted to his committee's report, Gill made remarks that included some observations about the way newspeople "strive constantly to blow the whistle on those in politics...government...business...those in any calling guilty of conflict of interest."[55]

"So isn't it about time," he asked, "that we take a searching look at our own ethical standards...?"[56]

In the conclusion of his committee's report, Gill posed this question: Should there now come a concerted effort...to encourage the formulation of some sort of Code...?[57]

"In the view of the committee chairman," Gill said, "the answer...is an unqualified 'yes'."

Although it did not undertake the creation of a proposed code, APME's 1973 committee continued to pursue ethical issues.

"Whither Professional Standards?" prefaced the committee's report, which contained an overview also, entitled "Ethics: a Growing Concern."[58]

Under the leadership of Paul Poorman of the Detroit News, the 1973 committee explored "freebies," self-serving "contest " awards, "junketeering," techniques for improving accuracy, public service obligations, threats to newspaper credibility, student perceptions of journalistic objectivity, and reader opinion of newspaper ethics.[59]

Following the 1973 convention, Joseph Shoquist of the Milwaukee Journal became chairman of the committee, and it began to move, almost immediately, toward the creation of a formal code.

In a December 31 memorandum, Shoquist stated that the committee's main goal, in 1974, would be "to formulate a code of ethics..."[60]

The previous two committees had done an outstanding job, Shoquist said, "of identifying the current state of newspaper ethics," the logical next step is to set up a code of standards that can be adopted by individual newspapers.[61]

While other members of the committee conducted followup studies aimed at the better delineation of practices important in the evaluation or assessment of ethical levels in newspaper performance, Shoquist made the projected code his own responsibility.

Three other members of the committee were selected by Shoquist to assist him, as members of a special sub-committee, and the project got underway.

Using ideas from the earlier "criteria" committee, integrating into its consideration the findings of its two predecessor committees, and drawing on Shoquist's own experience and that of others in the creation of codes for individual newspapers, in addition to obtaining input from the sub-committee members,[62] Shoquist completed his study within a few weeks, wrote the code, and presented it that November to the 1974 convention.[63]

In moderating a convention program,[63] Shoquist called the delegates attention to the proposed code.[64] Reaction to it proved favorable, generally, and following minor changes[65] the code was approved the following spring by APME's board of directors.[66] In its final adoption form, it read:

> This code is a model against which newspaper men and women can measure their performance. It is meant to apply to news and editorial staff members and others who are involved in, or who influence, news coverage and editorial policy. It has been formulated in the belief that newspapers and the people who produce them should adhere to the highest standards of ethical and professional conduct.
>
> RESPONSIBILITY
>
> A good newspaper is fair, accurate, honest, responsible, independent and decent. Truth is its guiding principle. It avoids practices that would conflict with the ability to report and present news in a fair and unbiased manner. The newspaper should serve as a constructive critic of all segments of society. It should vigorously expose wrongdoing or misuse of power, public or private. Editorially, it should advocate needed reform or innovations in the public interest. News sources should be disclosed unless there is clear reason not to do so. When it is necessary to protect the confidentiality of a source, the reason should be explained. The newspaper should background, with the facts, public statements that it knows to be inaccurate or misleading. It should uphold the right of free speech and freedom of the press and should respect the individual's right of privacy. The public's right to know about matters of importance is paramount, and the newspaper should fight vigorously for public access to news of government through open meetings and open records.
>
> ACCURACY
>
> The newspaper should guard against inaccuracies, carelessness, bias or distortion through either emphasis or omission. It should admit all substantive errors and correct them promptly and prominently.
>
> INTEGRITY
>
> The newspaper should strive for impartial treatment of issues and dispassionate handling of controversial subjects. It should provide a forum for the exchange of comment and criticism, especially when such comment is opposed to its editorial positions. Editorials and other expressions of opinion by reporters and editors should be clearly labeled. The newspaper should report the news without regard for its own interests. It should not give favored news treatment to advertisers or special-interest groups. It should report matters regarding itself or its personnel with the same vigor and candor as it would other institutions or individuals. Concern for community, business or personal interests should not cause a newspaper to distort or misrepresent the facts.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

> The newspaper and its staff should be free of obligations to news sources and special interests. Even the appearance of obligation or conflict of interest should be avoided. Newspapers should accept nothing of value from news sources or others outside the profession. Gifts and free or reduced-rate travel, entertainment, products and lodging should not be accepted. Expenses in connection with news reporting should be paid by the newspaper. Special favors and special treatment for members of the press should be avoided. Involvement in such things as politics, community affairs, demonstrations and social causes that could cause a conflict of interest, or the appearance of such conflict, should be avoided. Outside employment by news sources is an obvious conflict of interest, and employment by potential news sources also should be avoided. Financial investments by staff members or other outside business interests that could conflict with the newspaper's ability to report the news or that would create the impression of such conflict should be avoided. Stories should not be written or edited primarily for the purpose of winning awards and prizes. Blatantly commercial journalism contests, or others that reflect unfavorably on the newspaper or the profession, should be avoided.
>
> * * *
>
> No code of ethics can prejudge every situation. Common sense and good judgment are required in applying ethical principles to newspaper realities. Individual newspapers are encouraged to augment these APME guidelines with locally produced codes that apply more specifically to their own situations.[67]

Since one of the objectives of the code was to provide a model for individual newspapers, the association's committee on professional standards conducted a 1976 survey aimed at determining how many newspapers had adopted codes. More than 40 were identified.[68]

Of those codes available for its analysis, the committee reported, "all resembled the model code, closely, except in the section on "conflicts of interest" (political activity, "moonlighting," acceptance of gifts and other favors, "junketeering," etc.).[69]

None of the editors responding to APME's inquiry expressed negative thoughts about codes. Rather, most said they considered such codes necessary.[70]

However, newspaper Guild opposition to the manner in which such a code was made a part of news department policy at Madison, Wisconsin, and later Pottstown, Pennsylvania, caused some editors to hesitate.[71]

Because of his leadership in the area of newspaper ethics, as administrator of his own newspaper's stern code as well as author of APME's code,[72] Shoquist served as a lecturer on the subject, frequently, at American Press Institute seminars for managing editors and city editors.[73]

From those and other related activities, Shoquist concluded that the APME code, in addition to being a response to increasing concern over news media ethics throughout this country, stimulated additional progress toward more perceptive re-examination of ethical standards.[74]

Impact of the APME code beyond its own membership is reflected in a code adopted May 21, 1977, by the Pennsylvania Society of Newspaper Editors. PSNE, a state counterpart of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, acknowledged its indebtedness to not only ASNE's code, but APME's, also.[75]

Basic principles imbedded in all three of journalism's best-known codes--those of APME, ASNE, and the Society of Professional Journalists--have been found to be quite similar, and to contain much in common.[76]

During 1977, APME's committee on professional standards continued its studies of "freebies," newspaper credibility, contests, and other ethical issues.[77]

Following a seminar on "Controlling Those Capitol Perks," in which Paul LaRocque, chairman of the committee, participated, the 1977 APME convention adopted, unanimously, a resolution urging newspapers to pay their own expenses covering government.[78]

Moving into APME's seventh year of special attention to professional standards, the 1978 committee accepted these assignments: (1) Case studies on newspaper promotion of its own events as opposed to promotion of other community events; (2) When does a newspaper hold back news and why?; (3) Press-created issues and why they were created; (4) What the reader thinks of newspaper efforts to improve credibility; (5) How far does a newspaper go in reporting a sensational news event before it tests the limits of good reporting?; (6) A case

study of a hoax letter to the editor; (7) Commercial interest and influence on food writers and special sections; (8) The relationship between sports-writers and coaches: (9) Capitol perquisites--picking up where last year's study ended; and (10) Ethics codes and press councils.[79]

In order to assess the impact of such studies in professional standards, and the impact of APME's code, generally, upon actual practice, systematic studies--qualitative and quantitative research, also--are needed.

In summary, it can be concluded that the professional standards committee has become a standing part of APME's program of continuing studies, and that the code that it created serves now as one of our profession's generally acknowledged points of reference in continuing discussion of efforts to further elevate newspaper ethical standards around the country.[80]

For example, the code was cited recently, by a professor of journalism, in a public discussion of reportorial secrecy.

"A policy of disclosure is not as radical," he remarked, "as it may sound to some. It should be noted that the Associated Press Managing Editors Association has in it a provision that states 'News sources should be discussed unless there is clear reason not to do so'..."[81]

That is the purpose of any kind of code--to serve as a benchmark, in discussion, and a standard against which action is measured.

APME's code can be seen, therefore, as bringing the experience of the past--its many years of evolution--to bear upon the future.[82]

# # #

NOTES

1. For a perceptive and recent exploration of the dynamics of ethicizing, generally, see Richard L. Johannesen, Ethics in Human Communication, (Columbus, Ohio:Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1975).

2. The background of ethicizing in journalism is reviewed in Clifford G. Christians, "Mass Media Ethics: An Analysis of the Academic Literature," College of Communications, University of Illinois, 1976. See, also, Bernard Rubin, "The Search for Media Ethics" chapter I in Questioning Media Ethics (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1978), pp. 3-39; and Joseph P. McKerns "Media Ethics: A Bibliographic Essary," Journalism History, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Summer, 1978), pp. 50-53, 68.

3. Penn Kimball, "Journalism Arts, Craft, or Profession?" in Kenneth Lynn (ed.) The Professions in America, (Boston:Beacon, 1963), p. 11.

4. Michael T. Malloy, "Journalistic Ethics: Not Black, Not White, But...A Rainbow of Gray," National Observer, July 26, 1975, pp. 1, 16.

5. David J. LeRoy, "Journalism as a Profession," Mass News Practices, Controversies and Alternatives, eds. D. J. LeRoy and C. H. Sterling, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice-Hall, 1973), pp. 250-263. See, also, John W. C. Johnstone, Edward J. Slawski, and William W. Bowman, "The Professional Values of American Newsmen," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 36, No. 4 (Winter, 1972-73), pp. 522-40.

6. See Robert S. Fortner, "The Self-Conscious Image and the Myth of an Ethical Press," Journalism History, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Summer, 1978), pp. 46-49.

7. See Clifford G. Christians, Quentin J. Schultze, and Norman H. Sims, "Community, Epistemology and Mass Media Ethics," Journalism History, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Summer, 1978), pp. 38-41, 65-67. For a recent report on research concerning newspaper credibility, with references to prior studies, see John D. Abel and Michael O. Wirth, "Newspapers vs TV Credibility for Local News," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 54, No. 2 (Summer, 1977), pp. 371-75.

8. "Watching the Watchdog: Ethics and the Power of the Press," in Social Responsibility: Journalism, Law, Medicine, edited by Louis W. Hodges, (Lexington, Va.:Washington and Lee University, 1977), p. 25.

9. Seib, p. 26.

10. Proceedings of the association's conventions are published annually, in a series entitled APME Redbook. An index to the series is available from the Associated Press.

11. In its beginning, APME concentrated upon cooperation to improve the news service provided AP's member newspapers. Through the years, APME has expanded its interests into more and more related areas.

12. For an extensive listing of organizations that have evolved, see "The Journalism Organization," The Quill, November, 1978, pp. 23-35.

13. The evolution of ASNE's code is recounted in Harvey Saalberg, "The Canons of Journalism: A 50-Year Perspective," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 50, No. 4 (Winter, 1973), pp. 731-34.

14. The Quill, November, 1973.

15. Available from National Conference of Editorial Writers, P.O. Box 34928, Washington, DC 20034.

16. In 1934, a team of academic researchers at Bryn Mawr college identified and analysed codes representing the following newspaper organizations: American Society of Newspaper Editors, Kansas Editorial Association, Oregon State Editorial Association, Missouri State Press Association, Texas Press Association Washington Press Association, South Dakota Press Association, Wisconsin Press Association, Southern Newspaper Publishers Association, Illinois Press Association, New Jersey Press Association, Philadelphia Public Ledger, Brooklyn Eagle, Christian Science Monitor, Springfield (Mass.) Republican, Detroit News, Seattle Times, and Hearst chain. See Susan M. Kingsbury, Hornell Hart Associates, "Measuring the Ethics of American Newspaper, VII: Comparative Analysis of Newspaper Ethical Codes," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 11, No. 4 (December, 1934), pp. 361-81. The "Oregon Code of Ethics for Journalism" had been adopted, in 1922, before ASNE's "canons."

17. Available from the American Newspaper Guild, 1125 Fifteenth St., NW, Washington, DC 20005.

18. Concerns and activities of APME, as reflected in annual convention programs and the Redbook series, are reported in APME News and committee reports.

19. For illustration, see John De Mott, The Program Primer: A Handbook of Suggestions for Professional Development Activities in Chapters of Sigma Delta Chi. (Chicago:Society of Professional Journalists, 1965).

20. For recent example, including reference to previous studies, see Stuart H. Schwartz, "Inner-Directed and Other-Directed Values of Professional Journalists," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 55, No. 4 (Winter, 1978), pp. 721-25, 54. See, also, Virginia Olesen and Elvi W. Whittaker, "Critical Notes on Sociological Studies of Professional Socialization," Professions and Professionalization, ed. J. A. Jackson (London:Cambridge University Press, 1970).

21. Helpful, in this field, are Wilbert E. Moore, The Professions: Roles and Rules (New York:Russell Sage Foundation, 1970); Ernest Greenwood, "Attributes of a Profession," Social Work, Vol. 2, (July, 1957), pp. 45-55; Sigmund Nosow and William H. Form, eds., Man, Work, and Society; a Reader in the Sociology of Occupations (New York:Basic Books, 1964); Howard M. Vollmer and Donald L. Mills, eds., Professionalization (Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice-Hall, 1966); Ronald M. Pavalko, Sociology of Occupations and Professions (Itasca, Ill: F. F. Peacock Publishers, 1971); Julius A. Roth, Sheryl K. Ruzck and Arlene K. Daniels, "Current State of the Sociology of Occupations," Sociological Quarterly, Vol. 14 (Summer, 1973), pp. 309-33; Julius A. Roth, "Professionalism the Sociologist's Decoy," Sociology at Work and Occupations, Vol. 1 (February, 1974), pp. 6-23; Edward Gross, Work and Society (New York:Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1958); and Everett Hughes, Men and Their Work (Glencoe, Ill:Free Press, 1958).

22. John De Mott, "Journalism's Old Argument: What Is a Profession, Anyway?" Grassroots Editor, Vol. 15, No. 6 (Nov-Dec., 1974), p. 8.

23. Ibid, p. 7.

24. Hodges, p. 26.

25. Ibid.

26. Not only were "freebies" discussed by APME members, with concern, but r[illegible]d discussions occurred at meetings of other newspaper executives--includi[illegible] publishers. For example, see "Editorial" section of "Discussion of Topics" part of Report of the Seventy-Fourth Annual Convention of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, 1960, pp. 230-34.

27. What Makes a Good Newspaper? (New York:The Associated Press, undated), p. 6.

28. Ibid.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid, p. 8.

31. For recent treatments of this subject, see Dwight E. Sargent, "What Makes a Newspaper Great?," Nieman Reports, Vol. 33, No. 1 (Spring, 1979) pp. 40-41; and Michael Davies, "Recipe: Newspaper creme de la creme," The Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, No. 621 (February, 1979) pp. 3-5.

32. What Makes a Good Newspaper, p. 4.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid.

35. Commission on Freedom of the Press, A Free and Responsible Press (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947) pp. 20-21. For commission's interpretation, see "The Requirements", Chapter 2, pp. 20-29.

36. For a comprehensive account of the Hutchins Commission, including press reaction to its findings and recommendations, see Margaret A. Blanchard "The Hutchins Commission, the Press and the Responsibility Concept," Journalism Monographs, Number 49 (May, 1977)

37. What Makes a Good Newspaper?, p. 5.

38. Ibid, pp. 5-6.

39. James E. Brinton, Chilton R. Bush, and Thomas M. Newell, The Newspaper and Its Public. (Palo Alto, Calif.:Institute for Communications Research, Stanford University, 1957).

40. What Makes a Good Newspaper?, p. 6.

41. Ibid.

42. Ibil.

43. Ibid, pp. 5-6.

44. Ibid, pp. 2-3.

45. Ibid, p. 1.

46. Ibid, pp. 2-3.

47. John De Mott, "A Litany For Newspaper Readers," Grassroots Editor, Vol. 15, No. 3 (May-June, 1974), p. 22.

48. John De Mott, "The Journalistic Church Service," unpublished presentation for Chicago Chapter, Religious Public Relations Council, 1976.

49. For examples, see APME Redbook, issues of 1963 through 1976.

50. For commentary and interpretative report on APME "Guidelines," see Robert V. Brown, "Shop Talk at Thirty," Editor & Publisher, Oct. 11, 1969, p. 68. (Although basically a manual for the basic training of news department staff, the book contains a "managing editor's prayer" that includes this observation: "May fortitude and wisdom be sufficient to initiate and prosecute the fights for decencies that conscience requires.") APME Guidelines is available from the Associated Press.

51. Edward M. Miller, letter to author, Jan. 6, 1969.

52. APME Redbook 1971.

53. Ibid.

54. "Professional Standards Committees," APME Redbook 1972, pp. 223-31.

55. "Principles and Practices," APME Redbook 1972, pp. 54-68.

56. APME Redbook 1972, p. 55.

57. Ibid, p. 230-31.

58. A Report by the APME Professional Standards Committee November, 1973. (New York:The Associated Press).

59. APME Redbook 1973.

60. "First Report," to John Leard, Barclay Jameson and members of professional standards committee.

61. Ibid.

62. The first draft of the proposed code contained the following article related to continuing education in journalism: "In addition to adopting and implementing the highest standards of professional conduct...the managing editor has special responsibilities...to assist members of the staff in the continuance of their education, through special study or in-service training, and support for efforts to improve journalism education in general." That article was deleted, however, in shortening the proposal later. (Joe Shoquist letter of Oct. 17, 1974, to members of professional standards committee.)

63. "Where Do We Stand on Ethics?," APME Redbook 1974, pp. 92-101.

64. For Editor & Publisher news report on Shoquist committee's presentation to convention, see "Ethical Behavior Progress seen in new APME Study," Nov. 23, 1974, pp. 9, 19.

65. Mentioned by Joe Shoquist, letter to author, Jan. 19, 1978.

66. For Editor & Publisher news report on final approval of code, see "Code of Ethics Adopted by AP Managing Editors," April 19, 1975, p. 11.

67. The adoption of a code of ethics, for all its newspapers, by the Gannett Company was reported in Editor & Publisher, May 21, 1977, p. 45. Previously, E&P reported "Ethics and Access Policy Adopted by Field Papers," Oct. 5, 1974. The experience of another newspaper, Wilmington's News-Journal, is related in "The News-Journal Approach," on pages 7-9 of Bernard Rubin (ed) Questioning Media Ethics (New York:Praeger Publishers, 1978). Oddly, the APME Code is not mentioned in "Journalistic Ethics: Some Probings by a Media Keeper," by Jas. C. Thomson, Jr. in Rubin's book, although both the ASNE and SPJ codes are reproduced, in full, as appendixes. Bruce M. Swain Reporters' Ethics (Ames, Iowa:The Iowa State University Press, 1978) contains complete reproductions of the following: "Washington Post Standards and Ethics",(pp. 131-34; "Milwaukee Journal Rules and Guildelines",, pp. 127-30; "Scripps-Howard Newspapers Principles and Practices for All Persons," pp. 130-31; "Des Moines Register and Tribune Code of Ethics," pp. 117-21; "Chicago Sun-Times and Daily News Code of Professional Standards," pp. 116-17; "Louisville Courier-Journal and Times Policy on Outside Work of News, Editorial and Photo Department Staff Members," pp. 121-25; and "The Louisville Courier-Journal and Times Company--Conflict of Interest and Management Personnel," pp. 125-27.

68. For the report of this survey, see "Codes of Ethics," APME Redbook 1976, p. 221.

69. Ibid, p. 221.

70. Ibid.

71. For a comprehensive review of this issue, see Mark Nelson "Newspaper Ethics Codes and the NLRB," Freedom of Information Center Report No. 353 (School of Journalism, University of Missouri, May, 1976). The legal controversies involving Madison's Capital Times and Pottstown's Mercury are reviewed in Keith P. Sanders and Won H. Chang "Codes--the Ethical Free-For-All," Freedom of Information Center Report Series No. 7, March, 1977.

72. The Milwaukee Journal distributes its code widely among people in public relations, politics, and similar areas, and publishes the code four times a year, for the general public's benefit. For an example, see promotion advertisement "Rules and Guidelines," The Milwaukee Journal, Sunday, Feb. 12, 1978, p. 3, Part 5.

73. Telephone interview, February 23, 1978.

74. See Jos. W. Shoquist "What Newspapers Are Doing About Their Public Image," Public Relations Journal, Vol. 31, No. 8 (August, 1975) pp. 17-19.

75. See introduction to PSNE Code of Ethics, available from Pennsylvania Society of Newspaper Editors.

76. Lucas G. Staudacher, "Ethics Codes: the Positive and Negative," Report of Committee on Professional Standards, APME, October, 1977, p. 17.

77. APME Redbook 1978.

78. Robert M. Stiff, "Resolved: Press Should Pay its Way," APME News, December, 1977, p. 21.

79. "Continuing Study Committees Facing September Challenge," APME News February, 1978, p. 1-2.

80. Swain Reporters' Ethics uses sections of the APME code, and other news organization codes, as starters for discussion of ethical standards.

81. Jerry Chaney, "A Policy of Disclosure Advocated," Editor & Publisher, March 3, 1979, p. 31.

82. For additional perspective on origin of newspaper codes and their development through the years, see Nelson Atrim Crawford, The Ethics of Journalism (New York:Alfred A. Knopf, 1924); Leon Nelson Flint, The Conscience of the Newspaper (New York:D. Appleton & Co., 1925); J. Edward Gerald, The Social Responsibility of the Press (Minneapolis:The University of Minnesota Press, 1963); John C. Merrill and Ralph D. Barney, eds., Ethics and the Press: Readings in Mass Media Morality (New York:Hastings House, 1975); and John Hulteng, The Messengers Motives:Ethical Problems of the News Media (Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice-Hall, 1976. For comparison of APME code and others in United States with those of other societies, see Press Councils and Press Codes (Zurich:International Press Institute, 1966).